

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

DATE MAILED: 03/23/2004

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/049,219	01/17/2002		Bernard Danner	1999CH006	9387	
25255	7590	03/23/2004		EXAMINER		
	CLARIANT CORPORATION				KUMAR, PREETI	
INTELLEC' 4000 MONE		OPERTY DEPARTM	MENT	ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
CHARLOT				1751		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			<i>~</i>
··	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/049,219	DANNER ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Preeti Kumar	1751	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address	3
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a report of NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statuted the normal of the provided by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a reply oly within the statutory minimum of thirty (3 will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH e, cause the application to become ABAN	y be timely filed (0) days will be considered timely. S from the mailing date of this communi DONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	ication.
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 L	December 2003.		
	s action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa		s, prosecution as to the men	its is
closed in accordance with the practice under			
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 18-34 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 18-34 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	awn from consideration.		
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	or election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin		u e	
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ac			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the			104/4/
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	·	•
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documer 2. Certified copies of the priority documer 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documer application from the International Bures * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. Its have been received in Appority documents have been reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	olication No ceived in this National Stag	e
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08	Paper No(s)/N 5) Notice of Info	nmary (PTO-413) Mail Date rmal Patent Application (PTO-152)	
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/22/2003</u> .	6)		

Application/Control Number: 10/049,219

Art Unit: 1751

DETAILED ACTION

Non-Final Rejection after RCE

Response to Amendment

- 1. Claims 18-34 are pending.
- 2. The rejection of claim 30 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph is withdrawn in light of applicant's amendment 12/22/2003.
- 3. The rejection of claims 18-21 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Joyner et al. (US 4,483,969) is maintained for the reasons recited in the previous office actions.
- 4. The rejection of claims 18-34 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miracle et al. (US 5,576,282) is maintained for the reasons recited in the previous office actions.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed December 22, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive because Applicant's have not stated how the amendments to the claims overcomes the rejection of record by pointing out disagreements with the examiner's contentions. Applicant's have not discussed the references applied against the claims, explaining how the claims avoid the references or distinguish from them. The lack of arguments makes it difficult for the Examiner to see how the amendments filed December 22, 2003 overcome the rejection of record. Specifically, Miracle et al. (col.17-18) and Joyner et al. (col.2, ln.4-24) provide teaching of an emulsion useful for textile treatment encompassing the polyester recited in the newly amended claims.

Application/Control Number: 10/049,219 Page 3

Art Unit: 1751

Examiner finds no support or basis for the argument that the amended claims 18-20 now distinguish the instant claims over the prior art.

Information Disclosure Statement

6. The information disclosure statement filed December 22, 2003 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(3) because it does not include a concise explanation of the relevance, as it is presently understood by the individual designated in 37 CFR 1.56(c) most knowledgeable about the content of the information, of each patent listed that is not in the English language. Also, the relevance of providing the examiner with the title pages and table of contents of the literature on surfactants has not been addressed by the Applicant. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

New Grounds of Rejection

Claim Objections

7. Claims 18-34 are objected to because of the following informalities: The use of the (Ps), (A1), (A21), (E21), (T), (GL), (B1), (H1), (H), (H3), (X), (Y), (Z), (G), (W"), (W'), (Ps'), and all the other variables in the claims is unnecessary and makes the claims difficult to comprehend and makes many claims incomprehensible.

For example claim 23 denotes G as containing one of X,YorZ and then claims 30 and 32 denotes G as a thickening agent. Another example variable confusion is revealed by the material limitations of claims 29 and 33 reciting (X), (Y), (Z), (G), when (G) already encompasses (X), (Y), and (Z). Also, claims 32 and 33 denote variable W"

Application/Control Number: 10/049,219

Art Unit: 1751

and W' as the same aqueous polyester composition. Also in claim 33 it is not clear what, if anything the Ps' variable is meant to denote.

Examiner suggests not using variables at all and using <u>definite words</u> to define the boundaries of the subject matter for which patent protection is sought. Removal of all the variables is requested as they do nothing but provide confusion and unclearity in the examination and prosecution process for both the Examiner and the Applicant. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 8. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

 The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 9. Claims 27-29, 32-33 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 27-29 and 32-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps, such omission amounting to a gap between the steps. See MPEP § 2172.01. The examiner does not see how the product claims are referring to method claims and the material limitations in the claims and the disclosure provide no clarity on what method steps are being referred to. The claims are generally narrative and indefinite, failing to conform with current U.S. practice. They appear to be a literal translation into English from a foreign document and are replete with grammatical and idiomatic errors.

Application/Control Number: 10/049,219

Art Unit: 1751

Conclusion

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Preeti Kumar whose telephone number is 571-272-1320. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00am - 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yogendra N. Gupta can be reached on 571-272-1316. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Preeti Kumar Examiner Art Unit 1751

PK

MARGARET EINSMANN PRIMARY EXAMINER GROUP 1100

Margaret Ensmann